



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/890,548	01/09/2002	Peng Chum Loh	5196-000003	4658 13
7590	05/02/2003			
Harness Dickey & Pierce PO Box 828 Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303			EXAMINER	
			WESSMAN, ANDREW E	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1742				
DATE MAILED: 05/02/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/890,548	LOH, PENG CHUM
	Examiner Andrew E Wessman	Art Unit 1742

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2003.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-6, 8-11 and 13-15 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-6, 8-11 and 13-15 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                    5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.                    6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 13-15 remain for examination. Claim 7 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 5, and 13 have been amended.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 29, 2003 has been entered.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '729 and JP '847.

JP '729 and JP '847 are applied to the claims for the reasons set forth in paper No. 9, paragraphs 4-7.

With regards to the amendment to the claims, claim 1 has been amended to include the features of cancelled claim 7, and this feature is addressed in paper No. 9, paragraph 7. With regards to the amended feature of claim 5, the claim has been

amended to independent form, but the scope of the claim has not been changed, and the rejection of the claim is maintained. With regards to the amendment to claim 13, the amendment clarifies the claim but does not change its scope.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed January 29, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, applicant argues:

- (1) The prior art does not teach the ratio of gold to aluminum in the alloy, and clearly teaches examples of the alloy having unacceptable properties; and
- (2) The prior art does not teach the small additions of nickel or palladium as claimed.

With regards to applicant's argument (1), the evidence supplied by applicant regarding the properties of the claimed alloy is insufficient to demonstrate an unexpected result achieved by the claimed invention. Applicant's disclosure simply states that the properties of some prior art alloys are "unacceptable" while not providing a factual basis for this conclusion. Furthermore, applicant's showing of unexpected results must compare the closest prior art, Ex Parte Beck, 9 USPQ 2000 (BPAI 1987). In the instant invention, applicant is invited to submit the comparison results to demonstrate the criticality of the Au/Al ratio range of 3.66 or greater in terms of the "attractive metallurgical performance" as asserted.

With regards to applicant's argument (2), while the amounts of nickel and palladium in the prior art are not necessarily the same as those of the claimed invention, the amounts are in close approximation of one another, and the alloys are therefore

considered to be substantially the same. It is applicant's burden to show that the alloys do not have the same properties and are not necessarily the same. See MPEP 2144.05.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew E Wessman whose telephone number is (703)305-3163. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (703)308-1146. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9310 for regular communications and (703)872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.

AEW  
April 30, 2003

ROY KING  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700